

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-21 are pending in the application. Claims 4 and 16 are canceled and claims 1, 5, 7-9, and 13 are currently amended with this response. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4-5, 7-9, AND 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, and 13 were rejected as being indefinite because the phrase "configured to" did not give clarity as to whether the limitation is actually performed. Applicants respectfully disagree that the phrase "configured to" is indefinite because the phrase is meant to inform of an actual configuration or connection thereby making the limitation operable. However, in order to facilitate prosecution claims 1, 5, 7-9, and 13 have been amended to specifically denote the actual performance of the limitations. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buer (US Pub no 20040128553) in view of Krishna et al. (WO 01/05086 A2).

- i. The combination of Buer and Krishna et al. do not teach or suggest a security system comprising an output control system operable to receive at least a part of a decrypted payload of a subsequent packet before a status word of a preceding patent.*

Claim 1 is directed to a network interface system for interfacing a host system with a network to provide outgoing data from the host system to the network and to provide incoming data from the network to the host system. The network interface system comprises a security system operable to receive at least a part of a decrypted payload of a subsequent patent before a status word of a preceding packet.

The Office Action states that Buer does not explicitly disclose a security system configured to allow out-of-order writing of packet data to the output control system and

the output control system assembles the out-of-order data in correct order within the second memory. Further, the Office Action states that Krishna teaches a security system configured to allow out-of-order writing of packet data to the output control system and the output control system assembles the out-of-order data in correct order within the second memory. However, Buer in combination with Krishna et al. do not teach or suggest a security system as recited in amended claim 1 or 13.

Claim 1 recites a security system comprising an output control system operable to receive at least a part of a decrypted payload of a subsequent packet before a status word of a preceding packet. Krishna on page 9, lines 8-15 describes a distributor that selects the next free engine in round-robin fashion within a given flow in order for packets to be retired in round-robin fashion matching their order of issue. **No decrypted payloads of subsequent packets are received before a status word of a preceding packet** in Krishna. Further, no teaching in either Buer or Krishna et al. would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cited art in accordance with the claimed invention. Therefore claims 1 and 13 are nonobvious for at least this additional reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

- ii. The combination of Buer and Krishna et al. do not teach or suggest a core module of a security system operable to simultaneously decrypt and authenticate a packet payload for out-of-order writing of packet data to the output control system and the output control system assembles the out-of-order data in correct order within the second memory.**

Claim 1 is directed to a network interface system for interfacing a host system with a network to provide outgoing data from the host system to the network and to provide incoming data from the network to the host system. The network interface system comprises a core module of a security system operable to simultaneously decrypt and authenticate a packet payload for out-of-order writing of packet data to the output control system and the output control system assembles the out-of-order data in correct order within the second memory.

Krishna does not teach or suggest a core module of a security system that provides authentication and decryption for out-of-order writing of packet data simultaneously while the output control system assembles the out-of-order data in correct order within the second memory. Krishna states that packets are decrypted and authenticated, which implies serial processing, and no teaching is provided that indicates or implies that such actions are performed simultaneously as claimed. Further, no teaching in either Buer or Krishna et al. would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cited art in accordance with the claimed invention. Therefore claim 1 and 13 is nonobvious for at least this additional reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should any fees be due as a result of the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account Number 50-1733, AMDP761US.

Respectfully submitted,
ESCHWEILER & ASSOCIATES, LLC

/Thomas G. Eschweiler/
Thomas G. Eschweiler
Reg. No. 36,981

National City Bank Building
629 Euclid Avenue, Suite 1000
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 502-0600